REMARKS

Claims 3 and 4 are rewritten in independent form to secure their allowance.

The Examiner continues to reject claims 1 and 16 in view of Patel US 2002/0066573 and in the Response to Arguments admits that element 13 moves with 206 to allow the ball 22 to move to another of its end positions as between open and closed.

In an effort to advance prosecution, Applicants have attempted with this amendment to take a fresh approach to help the Examiner see the difference between these devices. Patel uses two j-slot assemblies. The ball 22 is connected to mandrel 14 that is in turn actuated by actuator 13. When mandrel 14 is sufficiently lifted, the ball 22 goes closed. However, subsequent action of mandrel 12 can open ball 22. The collet sleeve 206 is mounted to actuator 13 to hold the position of mandrel 14 while mandrel 12 is taken through the cycles of its j-slot mechanism. Eventually mandrel 12 comes out of its j-slot and hits actuator 13 that is connected to mandrel 14 and held temporaily indexed by collet sleeve 206. That impact makes collet sleeve 206 jump out of annular notch 214 that has a beveled profile and is designed to allow collet sleeve 206 to be released as fingers 215 jump out of notch 214 and flex into openings 208 in the actuator 13 to allow the downward movement of the mandrel 14 which moves ball 22 to the open position from the closed position.

This is covered in minute detail in paragraphs 36-37. What Patel teaches is a temporary support for mandrel 14 with ball 22 open as the j-slot for mandrel 12 is operated so that ball 22 can be closed when mandrel 12 gets out of its j-lot. As stated in paragraph 17 there are two j-slots to prevent unintentional opening and closing of the ball 22. Thus, there is no lock here at all, just a temporary support that is intended to be defeated with an applied force from mandrel 12.

Claim 1 is different. In claim 1 when the lock is actuated the movement of the movable member is impeded to the degree that the final controlled element can't go from one of its positions to the other despite the direct or indirect application of force to the lock. Patel clearly lacks this feature and anticipates that an impact of mandrel 12 on mandrel 14 will move the ball between open and closed while defeating the temporary support for mandrel 14 by collet sleeve 206. Claim 1 is not anticipated by Patel.

Claim 16 indicates that despite a lock that is not defeated by applied force to it directly or indirectly the valve member can still be operated with a portion of the mandrel to which it is connected by being separately released to move relatively to another portion of the same mandrel. One way this is done is described in the specification as a tool releases dogs that frees a portion of the mandrel that is attached to the ball so that it can be shifted while the other portion stays locked with the lock that doesn't let go. Patel clearly has no mandrel that gets locked and stays locked while still offering a way to operate the valve member using relative mandrel movement between mandrel portions.

Allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

12/01/2006

Gary R. Maze
Reg. No. 42,851
Duane Morris LLP
3200 Southwest Freeway
Suite 3150
Houston, TX 77027
Tel.: 713.402.3900
Fax: 713.402.3901

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that a copy of this document along with any referred to as attached or enclosed is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment; Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on 12/01/2006.

DM2\889372.1